

Comcast's blatant and deceptive blocking of peer-to-peer communications is exactly the problem millions of Americans have warned would occur without Net Neutrality protections.

The FCC must take serious and immediate action to put an abrupt end to this harmful practice and prevent other Internet service providers from following Comcast's example of discriminating against the free flow of online information.

The Internet is a vital engine for economic growth, civic participation and free speech. We simply can't allow corporate gatekeepers to smother these democratic communications by discriminating against new technologies, secretly interfering with Internet traffic and stifling innovation.

Selectively targeting protocols under the guise of "network management" is disingenuous at best, and blatantly dishonest at worst. If this is allowed to proceed, at what point does the Internet degrade to a point where it is totally unusable for other than corporately sanctioned 'functions'?

The argument is frequently made that "peer to peer" file sharing has no purpose other than the illegal distribution of copyrighted material, with no apparent acknowledgment that 'peer to peer' file transfer is the basis of most operations between systems.

For example:

A corporate office computer running Microsoft Windows accesses a shared folder in another office either across the hall or across the country, in order to retrieve a multi-megabyte file needed for a presentation. A 'peer to peer' file transfer has just occurred. Should these be 'regulated' by the service providers? And what is the criteria for determination of a transfer that should be allowed to proceed unimpeded versus a transfer that could be 'deferred'?

A software developer working at home needs to download a critical multi-gigabyte disk image of a new Linux operating system release in order to continue work on a project. In order to speed up the transfer a 'bit-torrent' client is launched to retrieve the file, accessing multiple sources spread across multiple servers and multiple service providers, which serves to spread the load rather than using a single source. Another 'peer to peer' file transfer. Comcast would claim that this is an improper use of the facilities that this developer is paying to use, and requires timely access to in order to do his job.

Have you ever sent an email to a colleague with a large attachment? By definition, the movement of this email and its attached file(s) is a 'peer to peer' transfer between the mail servers involved. What is the expectation of the average user of an email system for 'delays' in delivery of their correspondence? Should the service provider be allowed to 'defer' these transactions because they may be judged to

consume 'excessive' resources? Where does it all stop?

it is not within the purview of the service provider to make arbitrary decisions regarding the use of facilities that their customers have paid for with the expectation that they will be granted full, unrestricted access to the facilities and capacities that they have purchased.

If the facilities are inadequate to provide the services that the service provider have contractually obligated themselves to provide, then either the facilities need to be improved to the point where they can support the contracted customer load, or the provider needs to be much more honest in their dealings with the public and immediately cease marketing facilities and services that they can not in fact provide, rather than attempting to mask their inadequate capacity behind the guise of 'providing an improved customer experience through network management'.